



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,798	06/29/2001	Jiebo Luo	83025THC	8281

7590 06/29/2005
Thomas H. Close
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, JAMES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/896,798

Applicant(s)

LUO ET AL.

Examiner

James A. Thompson

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see page 6, lines 5-6, filed 19 April 2005, with respect to the rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC §101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC §101 listed in items 1-2 of the previous office action, dated 07 January 2005, has been withdrawn.

2. Applicant's arguments filed 19 April 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding page 6, line 7 to page 7, line 6: Applicant's arguments are based on the present amendments to the claims, and not the claims as filed prior to said previous office action.

Regarding page 7, line 7 to page 8, line 4: Applicant is respectfully reminded that Examiner is required to give the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims consistent with the specification (see MPEP §904.1). Despite the quote from the application cited in Applicant's present arguments, Applicant has not attempted to act as his own lexicographer. Therefore, the broadest reasonable interpretation of "K-means clustering operation" has been given. In Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684), there are K clusters provided based on K threshold values derived from the calculated histogram.

Regarding page 8, line 5 to page 10, line 16: Merely using a different type of histogram would clearly be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Using a non-cumulative histogram, such as taught by Ishiguro (US Patent 6,501,566 B1), instead of a cumulative histogram, such as taught

Art Unit: 2624

by Murayama, is a trivial use of an optional mathematical representation of data. Further, Applicant is respectfully reminded that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this case, the teachings of Ishiguro would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a non-cumulative histogram to detect peaks. In fact, both histograms can be used in an analysis of the image data since a histogram is simply a useful mathematical means by which data is represented. There is no requirement that only a cumulative or a non-cumulative histogram be used. In fact, the use of both would clearly have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention since both representations of the data provide different perspectives.

Regarding page 10, line 17 to page 11, line 13: By the very nature of the fact that Ishiguro is a single patent, Ishiguro teaches a system that is complete and whole unto itself. However, particular teachings can nonetheless be taken from Ishiguro to modify the system taught by Murayama, thus providing an improved result. The solution presented by Ishiguro is based upon the specific teachings and problems that were solved by Ishiguro. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would clearly have desired to use what was learned by Ishiguro in solving other problems. In the case

Art Unit: 2624

presented in said previous office action, the problem to be solved, which Murayama does not completely solve, is how to best determine the M reconstruction levels. Ishiguro provides the solution, which can then be incorporated into the teachings of Murayama. While Applicant may wonder why anyone would bother to combine Ishiguro with Murayama, it is sufficient that Examiner has demonstrated adequate motivation to combine. There are things that Murayama can do that Ishiguro cannot and things that Ishiguro can do that Murayama cannot do. Practitioners in the art require a variety of different teachings so that they may try new creative ideas and develop new systems and processes, rather than simply using only what is readily available.

Regarding page 11, line 14 to page 13, line 7: The newly added claims have been fully considered by Examiner. The rejections of the newly added claims, along with the previously presented claims and the amended claims, are given below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-2, 12 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684).

Regarding claims 1 and 12: Murayama discloses determining M reconstruction levels ($M < N$) based on the gray level distribution of the N level image, each said reconstruction

Art Unit: 2624

level being calculated using respective pixels of said N level image (figure 4 and column 9, lines 34-39 of Murayama); and applying multilevel error diffusion (column 14, lines 56-62 of Murayama) to the N level digital image using the M reconstruction levels to produce the M level digital image (figures 8-9 and column 12, lines 58-62 of Murayama).

Further regarding claim 12: Murayama discloses that the multitone processing method is performed using a computer program (column 14, lines 63-67 of Murayama).

Regarding claim 16: Murayama discloses clustering pixel values (figure 4 of Murayama) of the N level image into M ($M < N$) reconstruction levels (column 9, lines 34-39 of Murayama) based on the gray level distribution of the N level image (figures 2a-2b and column 9, lines 38-45 of Murayama); and minimizing error between the N level digital image and the M level digital image during said clustering (figure 2b; figure 5(S23); column 8, lines 44-49; and column 10, lines 22-24 and equation 5 of Murayama). Two methods are used to minimize the error between the N level digital image and the M level digital image during said clustering. The first method is to evenly distribute the threshold values based on the cumulative histogram (figure 2b and column 8, lines 44-49 of Murayama). The second method is to maximize the interclass variance (figure 5(S23) and column 10, lines 22-24 and equation 5 of Murayama), which also distributes the threshold values as evenly as possible, thus minimizing the error between the N level digital image and the M level digital image during said clustering.

Murayama further discloses applying multilevel error diffusion (column 14, lines 56-62 of Murayama) to the N level digital image using said M reconstruction levels to produce the

Art Unit: 2624

M level digital image (figures 8-9 and column 12, lines 58-62 of Murayama).

Regarding claims 2 and 17: Murayama discloses performing a K-means clustering operation on the N level digital image, wherein $K=M$ (column 8, lines 37-43 of Murayama). The number of cumulative pixels for increasing brightness in the histogram (figure 2b of Murayama) are used to determine the threshold values (column 8, lines 39-43 of Murayama). The total number of cumulative pixels are divided by the number of levels (M, or n in Murayama) that are used for the image reconstruction (column 8, lines 37-38 of Murayama), and thus the number of clusters (K) is equal to the number of reconstruction levels (M).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-6, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684) in view of Ishiguro (US Patent 6,501,566 B1).

Regarding claim 3: Murayama discloses determining M reconstruction levels ($M < N$) based on the gray level distribution of the N level image (figure 4 and column 9, lines 34-39 of Murayama); applying multilevel error diffusion (column 14, lines 56-62 of Murayama) to the N level digital image (figures 8-9 and

Art Unit: 2624

column 12, lines 58-62 of Murayama); and forming a histogram of the N level digital image (figure 2a and column 7, lines 26-31 of Murayama).

Murayama does not disclose expressly locating said M reconstruction levels corresponding to the M most prominent peaks in the histogram.

Ishiguro discloses locating M reconstruction levels (denoted by N in Ishiguro) (column 3, lines 24-25 of Ishiguro) corresponding to the M most prominent peaks in the histogram (figure 7 and column 7, lines 23-26 and lines 59-65 of Ishiguro). A histogram is created (figure 7 and column 7, lines 23-26 of Ishiguro) which set the pixel reference levels based on the number of pixels with densities within a set range (figure 7 and column 7, lines 59-65 of Ishiguro). As can clearly be seen from figure 7 of Ishiguro, this results in the four density levels (S0 to S3) corresponding to the four most prominent peaks in the histogram. This is further evidenced by the language of claim 14 of Ishiguro (column 10, lines 57-60 of Ishiguro).

Murayama and Ishiguro are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image binarization. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to set the M levels ($M < N$), taught by both Murayama and Ishiguro, based on the M most prominent peaks of said histogram, as taught by Ishiguro. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent degradation of the image quality when error diffusion is performed, which is a common result for predetermined threshold values (column 2, lines 57-65 of Ishiguro). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ishiguro with Murayama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 4-6, 13 and 18: Murayama does not disclose expressly that the first and last levels of the M levels are predetermined, wherein the first level is zero and the last level is the maximum possible level.

Ishiguro discloses that the first and last levels of the M levels are predetermined, wherein the first level (S0) is zero and the last level (S3) is the maximum possible level (figure 7; column 7, lines 24-26 and column 8, lines 31-34 of Ishiguro).

Murayama and Ishiguro are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image binarization. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to preset the first level to zero and the last level to the maximum possible level, as taught by Ishiguro. The suggestion for doing so would have been that halftone text data, which has lot of dark pixel surrounded by light pixels, is a common feature in images (column 2, lines 61-63 of Ishiguro). This produces the peaks at the low density end and high density end of the histogram, such as shown in figure 7 of Ishiguro. Thus, the first and last levels should be set to zero and the maximum possible level, respectively. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ishiguro with Murayama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4-6, 13 and 18.

7. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684) in view of Eschbach (US Patent 5,565,994).

Regarding claims 7 and 19: Murayama does not disclose expressly that the N level digital image has multiple channels and K-means clustering and multi-level error diffusion are performed on each of the multiple channels independently.

Art Unit: 2624

Eschbach discloses an N level digital image (column 4, lines 18-20 of Eschbach) which has multiple channels (column 4, lines 21-24 of Eschbach), wherein said multiple channels are processed independently (column 4, lines 23-25 of Eschbach).

Murayama and Eschbach are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple channel image data, as taught by Eschbach, upon which to perform K-means clustering and multi-level error diffusion, as taught by Murayama, with each channel being processed independently, as taught by Eschbach. The motivation for doing so would have been that independent (column 1, lines 32-35 of Eschbach), separated primary color channels are necessary for the production of digital color images (column 1, lines 24-31 of Eschbach). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Eschbach with Murayama to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 19.

8. Claims 8, 10-11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684) in view of Eschbach (US Patent 5,565,994) and Klassen (US Patent 5,621,546).

Regarding claims 8 and 20: Murayama does not disclose expressly that the N level digital image has multiple channels and K-means clustering and multi-level error diffusion are performed in multi-channel vector space.

Eschbach discloses an N-level digital image (column 4, lines 18-20 of Eschbach) which has multiple channels (column 4, lines 21-24 of Eschbach).

Art Unit: 2624

Murayama and Eschbach are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple channel image data space, as taught by Eschbach, upon which to perform K-means clustering and multi-level error diffusion, as taught by Murayama, with each channel being processed independently, as taught by Eschbach. The motivation for doing so would have been that independent (column 1, lines 32-35 of Eschbach), separated primary color channels are necessary for the production of digital color images (column 1, lines 24-31 of Eschbach). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Eschbach with Murayama.

Murayama in view of Eschbach does not disclose expressly that said multi-level error diffusion is specifically multi-level vector error diffusion.

Klassen discloses performing multi-level vector error diffusion (column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 3 of Klassen).

Murayama in view of Eschbach is combinable with Klassen because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically perform multi-level vector error diffusion, as taught by Klassen, as said multi-level error diffusion process. The motivation for doing so would have been to consider the effects of the interactions between dot patterns of different color components (column 3, lines 21-27 of Klassen). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Klassen with Murayama in view of Eschbach to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8 and 20.

Regarding claims 10 and 11: Murayama in view of Eschbach does not disclose expressly that said multi-level error diffusion is vector error diffusion.

Klassen discloses performing vector error diffusion (column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 3 of Klassen).

Murayama in view of Eschbach is combinable with Klassen because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically perform vector error diffusion, as taught by Klassen, as said multi-level error diffusion process. The motivation for doing so would have been to consider the effects of the interactions between dot patterns of different color components (column 3, lines 21-27 of Klassen). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Klassen with Murayama in view of Eschbach to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10 and 11.

9. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684) in view of Klassen (US Patent 5,621,546).

Regarding claim 9: Murayama does not disclose expressly that said multi-level error diffusion is vector error diffusion.

Klassen discloses performing vector error diffusion (column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 3 of Klassen).

Murayama and Klassen are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically perform vector error diffusion, as taught by Klassen, as said

Art Unit: 2624

multi-level error diffusion process. The motivation for doing so would have been to consider the effects of the interactions between dot patterns of different color components (column 3, lines 21-27 of Klassen). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Klassen with Murayama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684) in view of Ishiguro (US Patent 6,501,566 B1) and Eschbach (US Patent 5,565,994).

Regarding claim 14: Murayama in view of Ishiguro does not disclose expressly that the N level digital image has multiple channels and said determining and applying steps are applied to each of said multiple channels independently.

Eschbach discloses an N level digital image (column 4, lines 18-20 of Eschbach) which has multiple channels (column 4, lines 21-24 of Eschbach), wherein said multiple channels are processed independently (column 4, lines 23-25 of Eschbach).

Murayama in view of Ishiguro is combinable with Eschbach because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple channel image data, as taught by Eschbach, upon which to perform said determining and applying steps, as taught by Murayama in view of Ishiguro, with each channel being processed independently, as taught by Eschbach. The motivation for doing so would have been that independent (column 1, lines 32-35 of Eschbach), separated primary color channels are necessary for the production of digital color images (column 1,

Art Unit: 2624

lines 24-31 of Eschbach). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Eschbach with Murayama in view of Ishiguro to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

11. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684) in view of Ishiguro (US Patent 6,501,566 B1), Eschbach (US Patent 5,565,994), and Klassen (US Patent 5,621,546).

Regarding claim 15: Murayama in view of Ishiguro does not disclose expressly that the N level digital image has multiple channels and said determining and applying steps are performed in multi-channel vector space.

Eschbach discloses an N-level digital image (column 4, lines 18-20 of Eschbach) which has multiple channels (column 4, lines 21-24 of Eschbach).

Murayama in view of Ishiguro is combinable with Eschbach because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple channel image data space, as taught by Eschbach, upon which to perform said determining and applying steps, as taught by Murayama in view of Ishiguro, with each channel being processed independently, as taught by Eschbach. The motivation for doing so would have been that independent (column 1, lines 32-35 of Eschbach), separated primary color channels are necessary for the production of digital color images (column 1, lines 24-31 of Eschbach). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Eschbach with Murayama in view of Ishiguro.

Art Unit: 2624

Murayama in view of Ishiguro and Eschbach does not disclose expressly that said multi-channel image space is specifically multi-channel vector space.

Klassen discloses performing multi-level vector error diffusion (column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 3 of Klassen).

Murayama in view of Ishiguro and Eschbach is combinable with Klassen because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically perform multi-level vector error diffusion, as taught by Klassen, as said multi-level error diffusion process, thus making said multi-channel image space specifically a multi-channel vector space. The motivation for doing so would have been to consider the effects of the interactions between dot patterns of different color components (column 3, lines 21-27 of Klassen). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Klassen with Murayama in view of Ishiguro and Eschbach to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

12. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684) in view of Revankar (US Patent 5,649,025).

Regarding claim 21: Murayama discloses assigning pixels of the N level digital image to the M cluster centers to provide assigned pixels (column 8, lines 44-49 of Murayama); calculating values of said cluster centers based upon respective said assigned pixel (figure 4 and column 9, lines 34-45 of Murayama); selecting final values of said cluster centers as reconstruction levels (figure 4 and column 9, lines 34-39 of Murayama); and

Art Unit: 2624

applying multilevel error diffusion (column 14, lines 56-62 of Murayama) to the N level digital image using said reconstruction levels to produce the M level digital image (figures 8-9 and column 12, lines 58-62 of Murayama).

Murayama does not disclose expressly setting initial values of M cluster centers; and repeating said assigning and said calculating until a predetermined stopping condition is reached and, thereby, final values of said cluster centers are defined.

Revankar discloses setting initial values of M cluster centers (column 5, lines 6-9 of Revankar); and repeating the overall threshold operations (figure 6(304,306) and column 6, lines 56-65 of Revankar) until a predetermined stopping condition is reached (column 7, lines 1-5 of Revankar) and, thereby, final values of said cluster centers are defined (column 7, lines 1-5 of Revankar).

Murayama and Revankar are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data threshold determination. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to iteratively perform the threshold determination, as taught by Revankar, thus initially setting the value of the M cluster centers and repeating said assigning and calculating steps taught by Murayama until a predetermined stopping condition is reached, as taught by Revankar. The motivation for doing so would have been that different portions, or segments, of an image can be better halftoned if multiple thresholds are applied to each region, rather than a single global thresholding (column 2, lines 25-31 of Revankar). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Revankar with Murayama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 22: Murayama discloses that said assigning minimizes respective mean squared error (figure 5(S23) and column 10, lines 22-24 and equation 5 of Murayama). Maximizing the interclass variance (figure 5(S23) and column 10, lines 22-24 and equation 5 of Murayama), distributes the threshold values as evenly as possible. Since the equation for variance is based on the square of the difference between the respective classes (figure 5(23) and column 10, equation 5 of Murayama), the respective mean squared error is minimized.

Regarding claim 23: Murayama discloses that the stopping condition is a predetermined threshold (column 8, lines 23-29 of Murayama). After the [n-1]th threshold has been determined, the threshold determination is stopped (column 8, lines 23-29 of Murayama).

13. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684) in view of Revankar (US Patent 5,649,025) and Ishiguro (US Patent 6,501,566 B1).

Regarding claim 24: Murayama in view of Revankar does not disclose expressly that the first and last levels of the M levels are predetermined.

Ishiguro discloses that the first and last levels of the M levels are predetermined (figure 7; column 7, lines 24-26 and column 8, lines 31-34 of Ishiguro).

Murayama in view of Revankar is combinable with Ishiguro because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image binarization. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to preset the first level to zero and the last level to the maximum

Art Unit: 2624

possible level, as taught by Ishiguro. The suggestion for doing so would have been that halftone text data, which has lot of dark pixel surrounded by light pixels, is a common feature in images (column 2, lines 61-63 of Ishiguro). This produces the peaks at the low density end and high density end of the histogram, such as shown in figure 7 of Ishiguro. Thus, the first and last levels should be set to zero and the maximum possible level, respectively. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ishiguro with Murayama in view of Revankar to obtain the invention as specified in claim 24.

14. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684) in view of Revankar (US Patent 5,649,025) and Eschbach (US Patent 5,565,994).

Regarding claims 7 and 19: Murayama does not disclose expressly that the N level digital image has multiple channels and said setting, assigning, calculating, repeating, selecting and applying steps are performed independently on each of said multiple channels.

Eschbach discloses an N level digital image (column 4, lines 18-20 of Eschbach) which has multiple channels (column 4, lines 21-24 of Eschbach), wherein said multiple channels are processed independently (column 4, lines 23-25 of Eschbach).

Murayama in view of Revankar is combinable with Eschbach because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple channel image data, as taught by Eschbach, upon which to perform said setting, assigning, calculating,

Art Unit: 2624

repeating, selecting and applying steps, as taught by Murayama, with each channel being processed independently, as taught by Eschbach. The motivation for doing so would have been that independent (column 1, lines 32-35 of Eschbach), separated primary color channels are necessary for the production of digital color images (column 1, lines 24-31 of Eschbach). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Eschbach with Murayama in view of Revankar to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

15. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama (US Patent 5,936,684) in view of Revankar (US Patent 5,649,025), Eschbach (US Patent 5,565,994), and Klassen (US Patent 5,621,546).

Regarding claim 26: Murayama in view of Revankar does not disclose expressly that the N level digital image has multiple channels and said setting, assigning, calculating, repeating, selecting and applying steps are performed in multi-channel vector space.

Eschbach discloses an N-level digital image (column 4, lines 18-20 of Eschbach) which has multiple channels (column 4, lines 21-24 of Eschbach).

Murayama in view of Revankar is combinable with Eschbach because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use multiple channel image data space, as taught by Eschbach, upon which to perform said setting, assigning, calculating, repeating, selecting and applying steps, as taught by Murayama, with each channel being processed independently, as taught by

Art Unit: 2624

Eschbach. The motivation for doing so would have been that independent (column 1, lines 32-35 of Eschbach), separated primary color channels are necessary for the production of digital color images (column 1, lines 24-31 of Eschbach). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Eschbach with Murayama in view of Revankar.

Murayama in view of Revankar and Eschbach does not disclose expressly that said multi-channel image space is specifically multi-channel vector space.

Klassen discloses performing multi-level vector error diffusion (column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 3 of Klassen).

Murayama in view of Revankar and Eschbach is combinable with Klassen because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely digital image data halftoning. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically perform multi-level vector error diffusion, as taught by Klassen, as said multi-level error diffusion process, thus making said multi-channel image space specifically a multi-channel vector space. The motivation for doing so would have been to consider the effects of the interactions between dot patterns of different color components (column 3, lines 21-27 of Klassen). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Klassen with Murayama in view of Revankar and Eschbach to obtain the invention as specified in claim 26.

Art Unit: 2624

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Art Unit 2624



JAT
20 June 2005

Thomas D.
~~LEE~~ LEE
EXAMINER